

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action of August 27, 2007, claims 1-14 have been amended and claim 15 is newly submitted. Claim 15 corresponds to independent device claim 10, but is written using means plus function terminology. No new matter is added.

Nature of the Present Invention

The present invention increases the accuracy of voice input by allowing voice input under situations where there are no conditions fulfilled that could possibly interfere with voice input. Thus, the underlying principle of the present invention is to only offer an option if and when it is likely that the user can actually use the option successfully.

Claim Objections

At section 1, claims 5 and 10-14 are objected to for having numbers in parentheses. Appropriate correction has been made. Claim 5 is also objected to with regard to the phrase "with a hysteresis". The word "hysteresis" has a well-known meaning such as that set forth in the *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*, which defines "hysteresis" as "the lagging of an effect behind its cause, as when the change in magnetism of a body lags behind changes in the magnetic field". It is therefore believed that claim 5 is definite. However, in order to make clear this hysteresis effect concerning the displaying of indications of said voice input options on said display, minor amendment has been made to claim 5 which is believed to overcome the objection. Support for this amendment is found in the application as originally filed, including page 8, lines 7-13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

At section 3 of the Official Action, claims 1, 2, 3, 6-9 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated in view of US patent 6,742,021, Halverson, et al (hereinafter Halverson).

With respect to claim 1, it is asserted that Halverson shows in the figures (the specific figures are not indicated) a system, computer program and product, software

tool and method corresponding to the features recited in claim 1. It is specifically asserted that Halverson discloses checking, if at least one condition generally affecting voice input is fulfilled and providing said at least one voice input option and displaying indications of said voice input options on said display according to said condition.

In particular, Halverson is directed to a system, method and article of manufacture for navigating an electronic data source by means of spoken language. When a spoken input request is received from a user, it is interpreted and additional input is solicited from the user in a modality different than the original request and used to refine the navigation query. The resulting interpretation of the request is thereupon used to automatically construct an operative navigation query to retrieve the desired information from one or more electronic network data sources (Halverson, Abstract). It is the above-recited "additional input" which the Office asserts corresponds to "at least one condition generally affecting voice input" as recited in original claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention in a manner which clearly is not anticipated by Halverson. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite at least one condition that could possibly interfere with voice input and then providing said at least one voice input option and displaying indications of said voice input options on said display according to said condition.

Support for this amendment is found in the application as originally filed, including page 4, lines 9-11. This ability to check at least one condition that could possibly interfere with voice input and the providing at least one voice input option and displaying indications of said voice input options on said display according to the condition is not anticipated or suggested by Halverson. Consequently, claim 1 is not anticipated by Halverson.

Claim 10 is also rejected as anticipated by Halverson in view of Figure 1a, the Abstract and columns 3-4 of Halverson. Claim 10 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 and, for similar reasons as those presented above, is also believed to be not anticipated by Halverson.

Independent system claim 12 has also been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 and therefore is also believed to be not anticipated by Halverson.

Since each of the independent claims is believed to be not anticipated by Halverson, it is further submitted that claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11, 13 and 14 are also not anticipated by Halverson due to their dependency from an independent claim which is not anticipated by Halverson.

Referring now to section 4 of the Official Action, claims 1, 7-9 and 10-14 are also rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by US patent 6,532,447, Christensson. It is asserted that with regard to claims 1 and 7-9 that Christensson shows in Figures 1-4 a system, computer program product, software tool and a method for indicating speech-enabled input for multimodal interaction in an electronic device having a user interface with the features recited in claims 1 and 7-9. Specific reliance is made on Christensson to the Abstract, Figures 1-4 and column 5, lines 17-37.

Christensson discloses a proximity detector to control/enable a speech input, to avoid an unintended activation of the speech input. Christensson may also be interpreted as a kind of "touch-less" voice input activation feature. In Christensson, a proximity sensor checks whether any person is present in the proximity of the device in order to avoid unintended activation. Christensson is intended to prevent that a speech recognition means react to words spoken in the vicinity of the speech recognition means, that are not intended as a command to the speech recognition means (Christensson, column 2, lines 17-21). In other words, the technical problem is to avoid unintended activation of voice controlled functions and a waste of battery power in an electrical device (Christensson, column 2, lines 35-39). However, the feature of avoiding unintended activation of voice input may not be construed in a manner that the activation of the proximity sensor would be a condition that could possibly interfere with voice input, as it is not important if a proximity sensor indicates the proximity of anything, as proximity may not interfere with voice input. Christensson completely fails to display any voice input options (if and when voice input is possible).

In the Official Action with respect to the phrase “at least one condition generally affecting voice input” in claim 1, reference is made to the proximity sensor of Christensson. Such use of a proximity sensor is clearly different from claim 1 as amended which, as indicated above, specifically relates to at least one condition that could possibly interfere with voice input and providing at least one voice input option and displaying indications of said voice input on said display according to said condition. The proximity sensor in Christensson is for purposes of determining whether an object is sufficiently close to the sensor for activating the speech recognition function (Christensson, Figure 2 and column 4, lines 29-37).

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is clearly not anticipated by Christensson.

For similar reasons, independent electronic device claim 10 and independent speech recognition system claim 12 are also not anticipated by Christensson since each of these claims have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1.

Since each of the independent claims is believed to be not anticipated by Christensson, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7-9, 11 and 13-14 are also not anticipated by Christensson due to their ultimate dependency from an independent claim which is not anticipated by Christensson.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

At section 6, claims 2-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Christensson further in view of US patent 6,212,408, Son, et al (hereinafter Son).


It is stated by the Office that Christensson shows that key words are used, but does not specifically show that they are displayed. Son is relied upon for this feature recited in dependent claims 2 and 3. Claims 2 and 3 are believed to be not suggested by Christensson in view of Son due to the fact that they depend from an independent claim which is believed to be allowable.

Similarly, claims 4 and 6 are believed to be not suggested by Christensson in view of Son since they also depend from independent claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 27, 2007



Alfred A. Fressola
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,550

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955